DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 084 EA 023 453

AUTHOR Levin, Benjamin
TITLE Understanding Changing Environments.
PUB DATE Jun 91
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration (Kingston, Ontario, June 2-5, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Change; Administrator Attitudes; Cognitive Restructuring; Decision Making; *Educational Administration; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Informal Organization; *Organizational Change; *Organizational Climate; *Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

Issues in understanding organizational change from an interpretive viewpoint are explored in this paper, which discusses two perspectives for viewing organizational responses to their environments: (1) "environment" as an open concept (i.e., how "environment" is defined by participants in a given organization); and (2) organizational decision-making processes. Data were derived from two studies. The first study, based on interviews with 11 principals, examined school administrators' views of school responses to a changing world. The second involved four case studies of organizational response to change, based on document analysis, interviews, and observation. Findings indicate that the process through which organizations identify external issues is not dependent upon explicit models or structured procedures, but rather upon organizational routines, individual attitudes, organizational climate, and accidents. The recommendation is made to recognize the importance of informal and ambiguously defined understandings in relation to formal planning processes. (25 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED339084

UNDERSTANDING CHANGING ENVIRONMENTS

Paper Presented to the Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration

Kingston, June, 1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Benjamin Levin
Asst. Professor
Faculty of Education
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, MB
R3T 2N2

Phone (204) 474-8236
Fax (204) 275-5962
Bitnet: Levin@CCM.Umanitoba.CA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Levin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 023 153

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UNDERSTANDING CHANGING ENVIRONMENTS

Benjamin Levin

Introduction[1]

A year ago at CSSE I presented a paper entitled "A Changing Environment: Unchanging Schools" (Levin, 1990). That paper sought to investigate the apparent paradox that schools could remain substantially unchanged in a world which was widely regarded as rapidly changing. The paper was based on a review of literature on organization-environment linkages and on several kinds of data collected from educational administrators. Despite an extensive literature, in disciplines ranging from sociology and organizational behaviour to education and public administration, a very limited amount of empirical work has been done specifically to investigate the ways in which organizations understand and respond to changes around them. Most of the literature consists either of exhortations about the importance of change, or of theoretical propositions regarding these relationships. While much of this work is interesting and thought-provoking, questions remain about the adequacy of existing conceptualizations. Indeed, these two points - the lack of empirical work and the need for a stronger empirical base to derive better theoretical formulations - are often found in the body of literature reviewed (e.g. Warriner, 1984; Corwin, 1987).

My intellectual predilections are towards an interpretive view of organizations. I tend to see organizational phenomena as highly complex, and also highly resistant to explanation. The day-to-day world has its own integrity, which, though different, is not necessarily lesser than the integrity of social science accounts. One must therefore begin the investigation of organizational phenomena by trying to find out what people think and do, and how what they think influences what they do. It is also the case, though, that people's behaviour is influenced by a multiplicity of things, many of which may not be known to the people involved. People are not necessarily consistent, either in their espoused views or in their behaviour. Although we can almost always explain our behaviour, whether our explanations do indeed account for the behaviour is always an open question. And our intellectual capacity - our ability to understand - is quite limited in comparison to the incredible diversity and complexity of the world we inhabit. This applies not only to people who have to act (which is to say that managers will necessarily have incomplete understandings of the problems facing them) but also to theoretical formulations (which is to say that no description or theory will capture more than a part of any phenomenon).

These predispositions, the literature review and some initial data led me in the previous

---

[1]. The research reported in this paper has been funded by a University of Manitoba/SSHRCC grant in 1989, by a Strategic Program Grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada in 1990, and by a research contract from the Canadian Centre for Management Development, also in 1990. The views expressed are solely those of the author.

paper to suggest three central perspectives which should inform further study of organizational responses to their environments. In this paper, I will extend the discussion of these perspectives, primarily the first two of them, using data from two further studies.

Let me begin by restating the three perspectives developed in the earlier paper. At the outset, I note the difficulties caused by the very concepts of 'internal' and 'external'. A point which recurs in this paper is that these are not two separate worlds in practice, but, at most, different aspects of the same integrated whole. It is, however, hard to find an alternative language.

1. Treat the concept of 'environment' as an essentially open one; consider empirically what the concept might mean in any given situation and for any given set of people.

Most of the research on organizational environments has proceeded from an a priori schema as to what environments were. For example, commonly used is some combination of social, political, technological, economic, legal and demographic factors (e.g. Lam, 1981, 1985). Alternatively, descriptors such as turbulence, complexity, or uncertainty are used (e.g. Aldrich, 1979). However, when asked about their organization's environment, educators mention a wide range of factors which do not fit easily under such schemes (Fris & Balderson, 1988). It therefore seemed important to begin by asking about the environment as perceived by the organization, rather than beginning with the researcher's scheme.

This is not to say that the only important things are those identified by people in a setting. It is quite clear that people will not always recognize what is most important (Warriner, 1984). But attending to what people do notice, and why, is a crucial first step in understanding how organizations relate to their external worlds.

2. Give explicit attention to the processes through which organizations determine which aspects of the environment are most important and require some response.

Strategic planning processes tend to identify environmental scanning as an initial, separate phase in planning. In effect, one scans the environment, and then one gets on with things. However, more compelling work suggests that perception is not a simple matter, being influenced by a whole range of individual and organizational attributes (McKall & Kaplan, 1985; Keisler & Sproull, 1982) . Hodgkinson (1983) used the analogy of decisions as sandwiches of human calculation placed between a layer of affect on one side and ideology and value on the other. The study of organization-environment links must therefore consider how issues arrive on the agenda of any particular organization.

3. Study the ways in which schools and school systems respond to external change and pressure.

Two basic schools of thought exist on the matter of organizational responses to change.

One emphasize the role of management, and the organization, in responding to change. The second emphasizes the inability of organizations to respond effectively. Both schools seem to agree in concluding that most organizational responses are attempts to maintain stability and avoid changing dramatically, typically through some process of manipulating the environmental factors affecting them (Hedberg, 1981). Work in educational administration is consistent with this view in stressing the tendency of administrators to attempt to maintain the status quo in dealing with change (Fris & Balderson, 1988; McPherson, Crowson & Pitner, 1986; McLeod, 1984).

The Studies

Data from two separate studies are used in this paper. The first was a study of school administrators' views of school responses to a changing world. This study, supported by University of Manitoba/SSHRCC funds, involved an extensive literature review, and several kinds of explorations of the way in which school administrators saw the environment. I asked two groups of administrators to brainstorm important external influences on the schools, and to indicate how these issues had come to their attention. I collected some questionnaire data from a group of administrators on the kinds of changes they saw as most important, and on the adequacy of school responses to these changes. Semi-structured interviews were then conducted with eleven school principals who had not been involved in previous parts of the study around their understanding of external change, and their views about the schools' response to it. The principals were asked to indicate in the interviews the kinds of external changes which they saw as being most important, and to talk about the ways in which these issues came to their attention. They were also asked how well they thought the schools were responding to a changing world. Results of the interviews are being reported more fully at this conference by Peter Rae and John Brandon, graduate students at The University of Manitoba (Brandon & Rae, 1991).

A larger research project in the same area is now in progress, funded primarily by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRCC) and partly by the Canadian Centre for Management Development (CCMD), and conducted by me and Dr. Paul Thomas, my colleague from Political Studies at The University of Manitoba. This research, entitled "Understanding and Managing a Changing Environment", involves a set of case studies of responses to external change in four organizations. The organizations include a large urban hospital, a medium-sized suburban school district; a federal government department, and a large private sector financial services company. These organizations are regarded as research partners rather than as research sites. The partners are involved in all aspects of the study, including design and analysis. (The development of partnerships has, by the way, turned out to take a long time and a considerable amount of energy.)

The research has two main phases. The first is concerned with the way in which our partner organizations have developed an understanding of the external world facing them. We are

seeking to define the key external issues which each organization sees itself as facing. We also want to learn about the ways in which such issues have come to be seen as important; how they arrived on the agenda. In the second phase, we will examine how the organizations have tried to manage the key changes they saw themselves as facing. What strategies have they adopted, and why did they adopt them?

Our primary data sources are documents and interviews, together with some observations. We are using documents as initial entry points and as verification tools. Both public and internal documents, such as board and committee minutes, notes from senior management meetings, planning documents, and budgets, form a basis for identifying issues and developing an understanding of organizational history and process. We are then using semi-structured interviews with board members, managers, and others to understand the dynamics and subtleties which are so important yet are rarely written down in organizations. We assume that we will continue to use both data sources, and may also, where it seems appropriate to us and our partners, use observation of organizational events. We have undertaken to verify written materials, such as interview summaries and reports, with key informants in each organization.

As this paper is being written, the first phase of data collection is under way in two of the partner organizations - a school division and a hospital. By the time the paper is presented, we should have some data from the other two organizations as well. However, because the data collection process is still in its early stages, much of the discussion which follows is speculative. Indeed, in a way I am dealing with some possible results of the study before most of the research has been done.

Methodological Issues

Our study involves the recreation of organizational reasoning. We are trying to understand how the partner organizations understand the world, and how their understanding has developed. There is, of course, no guarantee that recreated understanding will the same as the events and ideas as they unfolded. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that understanding is always being recreated retrospectively (Mintzberg & McHugh, 1985; Aldrich, 1979). We assume that our respondents will, as do we all, put a good face on their own actions and ideas, and that their accounts will be influenced by a wide variety of experiences and motivations. The accounts of other participants, and the documents, will provide some basis for verification. We fully expect, however, to find discrepancies in views which cannot be resolved by evidence. Where appropriate, we will display these discrepancies in our reports to the partner organizations.

At the same time, an emerging literature on the study of people's accounts moves away from the view that the task of social science is to obtain - or perhaps create - an objective account. In education, recent work on creating and studying narratives (e.g. Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) is helpful. An alternative approach comes from the literature in social

psychology on ordinary explanations (e.g. Antaki, 19**,). A third relevant line of thinking can be found in Schon's work on practice (1983). All of these works stress the integrity of individual's accounts as representations of how people think about their situations. Since we are interested in the process of sense-making in organizations, we must pay attention to what people say.

The partnership nature of our current study also creates methodological issues. Although the study is not yet developed enough to be able to discuss these in detail, it is clear that we will face questions of how to represent our interpretations to our partner organizations, and how to work with them to create accounts which are seen as reasonable by all concerned. These are not new issues in social research, though there are no formulas for resolving them (Van Maanen, 1982).

1. What is the environment?

Several points can be made about conceptions of the environment. I begin with the responses of individuals, and then talk about the organizational level as a whole.

Individuals

Clearly, organization members are aware that they exist in a changing world. Any member of an organization can indicate a number of changes which he or she sees as significant for the organization, and organizational documents also reveal many external issues. The range of external issues identified as at least potentially important is very great. Indeed, although individuals vary quite a bit in the issues they list, at the organizational level it is hard to see an end to the listing of issues. Almost everything is potentially important to these organizations - if not immediately, then through second-order consequences. Let us take each of these in turn, beginning with individuals and then considering organizations as a whole.

Individuals varied quite substantially in the number of issues they identified as important, in the particular issues, and in the ways in which they spoke about issues. Keep in mind that our approach was simply to explain the purpose of our study, and to ask people to identify "external issues which you think are important for your organization". We provided no further prompting or schema at this point as to what such issues might be.

Some respondents could go on listing issues almost indefinitely. Others had only two or three which came to mind. Among the eleven principals interviewed in one study, the number of issues which they spontaneously mentioned varied between two and six. (I take six to be about the maximum which one would raise in a one hour interview, suggesting that these principals may well have been able to mention more had time permitted.)

Regardless of the number of issues mentioned, they were almost invariably spoken about

separately, with few linkages made between one issue and another. Among the principals, for example, it was unusual for a respondent explicitly to connect, say, the changing demography of the student body with the aging of the teaching staff and the introduction of new technology. We did not, however, explicitly pursue these connections, so their absence may be an artifact of the study.

Both commonality and diversity mark the identification of issues by individuals. One the one hand, there appears to be a kind of conventional wisdom in a given field as to what the key environmental changes are. In education, many respondents talk about changes in family structures, changing demographics and increased student diversity, increasing demands on the schools, limited resources, and aging teaching staffs. All of our eleven principals mentioned one or more of these issues. Similarly, in health care commonly mentioned issues are an aging population, the need to shift resources towards prevention, limits on public financing, and the impact of new technology. There is, then, some sort of common map of the external environment for any given kind of organization. Marshall and Mitchell (1990) have termed this the 'assumptive world' - the set of taken-for-granted matters which exists in any organizational setting.

It would be wrong, however, to conclude that objective features of the environment are decisive. Our evidence suggests that they are important, but no more so than the attitudes and dispositions of people in the organizations. For one thing, there is no unanimous mention even of these issues. Among the eleven school principals, no issue was mentioned spontaneously by more than eight, and some of these were mentioned in a way that was almost pro forma. Furthermore, in our partner school division, the issues identified vary depending on whether we were talking to trustees, superintendents, or principals. This is hardly surprising, but does reinforce the variety in individual views as to what is important.

At the same time, these common issues are labels or slogans more than they are fully-formed ideas. That is, different people will have different content under the same issue. In our respondents' talk, sometimes the issues mentioned first are not those which are spoken about at the greatest length or with the most intensity.

Here, for example, are several principals talking about changing family structures:

> With family breakups, there are safety nets from social agencies. There are kids living on their own because they won't follow rules at home...So they live on their own, and party and drink, and I'm not sure who's supervising...It's too easy, there's no commitment, by parents, by kids, by husbands and wives.
>
> We found out that there are more kids living on their own earlier than we ever knew about...Our mobility rates is 40% and 40% of our students come from single parent families...Most

> teachers are middle class and need to be reminded of the kinds of lives some of our students are living.
>
> Many students are living on their own, working many hours, who are weaker academically...In this school, and in society, increasing divorce rates and home problems are evident in the actions of students within the school...

One principal stresses responsibility in the family, another the gap between staff and students, and a third the impact on academic performance and behaviour. The issue is the same, but the perspectives on it, the tone given to it are rather different.

These common issues also act as conceptual screens, both admitting and hiding data. As is well known from work in cognitive psychology, data do not appear to us ready-made. Rather, they have to be recognized in terms of some set of existing categories or concepts. Each of our respondents has a set of mental lenses through which she or he sees the world (Donaldson & Lorsch, 1983). If there is a lens called "changing family structures", then incidents involving, say, children from single parent homes will be so noted. If there is a lens called "more demands on the school", then requests for services or programs may be interpreted in such terms. On the other hand, where there is no lens, things may simply not be seen. Prevailing ideology can therefore be important in shaping the issues which people see, or the evidence which they accept.

Although our respondents could easily cite examples for the issues they mentioned, they did not generally cite data or hard evidence in our study when they talked about issues in their school or school district. Some did mention data on, say, the number of students with children, or the proportion coming from particular ethnic backgrounds, but such references to data were infrequent. There were few indications of looking for counterevidence. Nobody had, to our knowledge, checked to see whether there were in fact more problems resulting from single-parent families. (Since this problem lens is widely shared, many are surprised to find that there were more single-parent families in Canada in 1931 and 1941 than in 1981; this does not fit with the conception of the problem.)

Organizations

There is no guarantee that an issue identified by a given individual will also be adopted as important by the organization itself. Indeed, we would expect to find individuals identifying issues which had no recognized place on the organizational agenda, and might also find issues on the organizational agenda which particular individuals did not themselves see as critical. Accordingly, one of the important aspects of the agenda formation process, which has not been addressed in the literature, is the relationship between the ideas of individuals and the official agendas of organizations. I will return to this question a little later.

How does one construct the organization's official agenda of external issues? We began with the official documents of the organizations. We reviewed several years of minutes of boards, board committees, and senior administrative groups to identify items which appeared there which could be regarded as reflecting pressures or changes external to the organization itself. We compiled lists of such issues taken from minutes of board meetings (at the hospital) and management meetings (at the school division).

Several conclusions seem warranted from this evidence.

First, the official agendas of these organizations are very heavily dominated by internal issues. These range from the tasks which a board must complete as part of its legal obligations (such as approval of contracts or staffing decisions) to what might be called the normal operations of any organization (such as construction of a budget) to the various operating concerns, and sometimes crises, which inevitably arise. For both the school division and the hospital, the vast majority of issues were focused internally. Here, though, we encounter the problematic distinction between 'external' and 'internal' issues, which makes it impossible to provide a count of issues in each category.

Secondly, a wide variety of external issues do reach the highest levels of the organization. Among the issues reaching the hospital board were Workers' Compensation policies, marketing projects, the site of the federal government's proposed virology lab, pay equity, biological waste disposal, abortion legislation, law reform proposals regarding powers of attorney, and a number of collective bargaining issues. Among the issues on the school division superintendents' agenda were the status of Child and Family Service Agencies, workplace safety and health, head lice, minor hockey, daycare, and employment equity.

However, much of the attention to external influences is apparently superficial. Many of the issues mentioned resulted in discussion, but no further action. My reading of the evidence so far is that external changes are relatively unimportant in themselves in these organizations. Rather, activity is driven by internal considerations, and external matters are tacked on to these. Or, to put it another way, external changes may be registered in any real way only when there is some handle in the organization's current activities on which to hang them. Again, more will be said about this in the discussion of how issues get on to agendas.

A final point here concerns the ad-hoc nature of external issues. In these organizations, at least, issues were not usually explicitly connected to any overall framework or conceptualization of the external world of the organization. None of our respondents spoke about a set of categories within which they saw the world, and from which particular issues arose. As with the individual responses, there were very few connections evident between one issue and another. Rather, each issue tended to be described and spoken about as if it had a separate existence. Again, this finding may be an artifact of the way in which our questions were posed. I anticipate raising this question directly with our partner

organizations as the study proceeds.

Relatedly, it is important to note that the issues mentioned do not fit neatly under the kinds of descriptors which have been used in the literature on environments. Although the use of headings such as economic, social, or technological may be useful heuristics for scanning purposes, they are not useful for classifying the issues raised by people in the organizations. Consider some of the issues most frequently raised in the two organizations. Changes in the composition of the student body are frequently mentioned by principals as important. One might initially classify such a change as social, or perhaps demographic. But the changes are also political, in that our approach to, say, increasing immigration, is strongly affected by political decisions about multiculturalism, or language policy, or because particular ethnic or linguistic groups have brought pressure to bear on the schools. In central Winnipeg, the native population has shifted from the areas in which it was most concentrated a decade ago. This, too, is a social change, but one strongly affected by economic issues such as housing. Concentrations of certain kinds of "special needs" students have been affected by recent court decisions which have allowed a wider distribution of group homes in the city.

Even what appears to be a straightforward issue is not necessarily so. Changing technology is frequently cited as a key challenge facing the health care sector. But the hospital's response to technology is very strong affected by economic considerations, such as the cost of equipment and any potential savings which it may create. And political considerations play a key role, as governments are pressured to provide the funds for sophisticated new forms of treatment regardless of evidence on their long term value.

These examples illustrate a point which has already been made - that the boundary between the organization and its environment is a very uncertain one. It is difficult to know, looking from inside the organization, which issues are 'out there' and which are 'in here'. Are the funding problems of child welfare agencies an internal issue for a school division or an external one? In that the division is not involved in such decisions, it is external. But it is connected to a number of aspects of the division's internal operations, and is talked about and reacted to as if it were essentially an internal matter. Pay equity legislation began as an external demand on hospitals in Manitoba, but became a heated internal issue. 'Out there' is in practice substantially determined by 'in here'.

2. How do issues reach the agenda of the organization?

The fact that so many issues are potentially relevant to any organization gives greater salience to the process through which issues are determined to be important. In their insightful book, McKall and Kaplan (1985) describe a number of ways in which issues reach the managerial agenda. These include being instructed to act, feeling that something can be accomplished, the degree of crisis involved, ownership of the issue, and others.

Individuals

We have tentatively identified several ways in which issues became salient based on our data. Again, it is necessary to distinguish between individuals and the organization as a whole. For individuals, direct experience is primary. The issues which strike them are those with which they collide in their work. For most respondents, in both studies, the primary response was that issues came to them in the course of their daily work, as they had to confront problems of other people.

Here are comments from some principals.

> It's very difficult to pin down how this happens [seeing an issue as important]. Personal perceptions are important. I rely on what I hear from my staff.
>
> The experience of having the kids in the school is fundamental, and the teachers are key. Teachers and resource teachers bring the issue to the table...
>
> I met with everyone in the school when I got here, and asked them to identify the issues in the school. So this [more troubled students]...comes out of the perceptions of the staff.

Only a few of the principals we interviewed mentioned direct contact with students as a source of issues. And there was infrequent mention (no more than 3 of 11) of sources such as pressure groups, governments, data analyses, or reading. Personal preferences play a very important role. Donaldson and Lorsch note about the managers they studied:

> Their beliefs provide a set of concepts that enable managers to make choices in areas where hard facts are often unavailing and where the tools of management science and economics are inadequate to the job. Without these belief systems, managers would be adrift in a turbulent sea, without charts. (1983, p. 129)

Thus we have a combination of events and ways of seeing those events. Things happen, but they meaning given to them will vary from person to person and setting to setting, supporting the point made in the literature that individuals in the same organization can have rather different views about the world the organization inhabits (Aldrich, 1979; McKall & Kaplan, 1985). Given the primacy of experience in shaping views of external influences, it is important to remember the earlier comment about the ways in which perceptions are influenced by the conventional wisdom in the field as well as by individual predispositions. Individual views are not created or maintained in a vacuum; they occur in a social context. More attention will need to be given later in our study as to the ways in which prevailing

of women in the hospital. Several unions met with the board to raise concerns - for instance, on the abuse of nurses by patients.

Finally, crises played a significant role in influencing organizational agendas. In contrast to a major part of the agenda, which was dominated by routine, another part resulted from significant deviations from the routine. A sudden shift in funding or policy, an impasse with a union, an issue which flared up in the media, or even a complain brought by an individual could shift the organization's attention in important ways.

As is the case with individuals, the primary sources for agenda setting are relatively ad-hoc, coming as they do from routines, from crises, or from individuals. Formal processes of environmental scanning or of planning appear to play a minor role in both organizations. Although both the school division and the hospital had formal planning processes, we did not identify in board or administrative minutes many issues which arose directly from those processes.

All this means that the agenda-setting process is, to use a favourite social science term, stochastic. It is often difficult to predict which issues will be picked up, and which will not. Longer-term changes are more diffuse and harder to pin down in some kind of way which allows action, hence may be less likely to arise as formal agenda items. Here is one principal talking about this question.

> The most tangible way [issues are defined] is through your enrolment, and also by the way decisions are analyzed through the school board office. Some ideas with merit are dismissed, while others, which seem ludicrous, gain attention; there's a shift in the basis of analysis. It's just floating around out there, people pick it up, trustees talk to each other, then a recommendation results.

Here is a second high school principal talking about the recognition of the need for alternative programs.

> It would be nice to say that we foresee problems and plan for them, but we don't do much of that...We responded because of students who are not succeeding in a regular program... that came out of a need we saw, either to ship students out or to deal with them ourselves.

Conclusion

The process through which organizations come to identify external issues is a complex and uncertain one. It depends on organizational routines, on the views and predispositions of

many individuals, on the prevailing climate of opinion, and on accidents. It appears not to depend very much on explicit models or structured processes.

My description of these preliminary ideas may sound like a criticism of organizations as being insufficiently rational and calculating in their approach to identifying issues. Such criticism has been made before. It is one of the mainstays of the enormous literature on better managing, and the work on strategic planning. It is not the conclusion I wish to draw, though.

The aspects of human thinking and organizational work which have been sketched are not to be regarded as failures or weaknesses, but as the conditions under which human organizational activity occurs. This is the way people do things, not because they are incompetent or unwilling or harried (though they may be these things), but because that is the way people are.

Social science often claims a privileged position vis-a-vis day to day or working knowledge. In his classic book on ethnomethodology, Harold Garfinkel (1967) pointed out that language is always imprecise; that no word or utterance could be pinned down to a 'once and for all' sense. Garfinkel then went on to note that this vagueness, which he called 'indexicality', was not a problem inimical to meaningful communication, but was an essential feature of meaningful communication. That we could not specify just what we meant did not prevent us from understanding each other most of the time, for most purposes. Alfred Schutz has made a similar claim in his work on relevance (1970). Schutz notes that what is salient for us shifts as our needs and motivations shift, and that this changing view of things is not problematic, but is instead constitutive of social life. It is, as the beer ad says, "the way we play".

In another context, Peter Berger has written eloquently about the relative merits of scientific and lay knowledge. Berger advocates

> the equality of all empirically available worlds of consciousness...All of us are moving around on the same level, trying to make sense of the universe...some of us try to convince others that our modus operandi makes more sense than theirs. Such efforts may or may not be laudable, but they are, in principle, transactions between equals. (1974, p. 127, 129)

So, too, in regard to organizations and their understandings (begging Thom Greenfield's question of whether organizations can have understandings). In point out that these understandings arise through processes which are not well defined by those participating in them, or that formal means such as planning processes or data analyses play a minor role, I am not suggesting that organizations must listen to experts who can tell them how to do things right. I am, instead, saying that this is the world in which we live, and our efforts

should be put towards doing something with it rather than wishing it were otherwise. And if this account itself seems to lack the analytic clarity and close tie from evidence to conclusion that one might want to find, then perhaps I am simply doing what I claim is inevitable!

REFERENCES

Aldrich, H. (1979). **Organizations and Environments.** Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Berger, P. (1976). **Pyramids of Sacrifice.** New York: Vintage.

Brandon, J. & Rae, P. (1991). The dilemma of change. Paper presented to the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Kingston, June.

Connelly, M. & Clandinin, J.(1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. **Educational Researcher** 19/5 2-14.

Corwin, R. (1987). **The Organization-Society Nexus: A Critical Review of Models and Metaphors.** New York: Greenwood Press.

Donaldson, G., & Lorsch, J. (1983). **Decision-Making at the Top.** New York: Harper & Row.

Dror, Y. (1986). **Policymaking Under Adversity.** New York: Transaction Books.

Fris, J., & Balderson, J. (Dec., 1988). Leaders' priorities and the congruity imperative. **Alberta Journal of Educational Research** 34/4.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). **Studies in Ethnomethodology.** New York: Prentice-Hall.

Hedberg, B. (1981). How organizations learn and unlearn. In Nystrom, P.& Starbuck, W. (Eds.). **Handbook of Organizational Design.** (2 vols). New York: Oxford University Press 3-28.

Hodgkinson, C. (1983). **The Philosophy of Leadership.** Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Kaufman, H. (1985). **Time, Chance and Organizations: Natural Selection in a Perilous Environment.** Chatham. NJ: Chatham House.

Kiesler, S. & Sproull, L. (1982). Managerial response to changing environments: Perspectives on problem sensing from social cognition. **Administrative Science Quarterly** 27 548-570.

Lam, Y.L. J. (1981). On organizational external environmental models: An integrative perspective. **Canadian and International Education** 10/2 40-47.

Lam, Y.L. (1985). Toward the construction of a school environment instrument: A conceptual framework. **Canadian Journal of Education** 10/4.

Levin, B. (1990). A changing environment: Unchanging schools. Paper presented to the meetings of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Victoria, June.

Marshall, C. & Mitchell, B. (1990). The assumptive worlds of fledgling administrators. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April.

McKall, M. & Kaplan, R. (1985). **Whatever It Takes: Decision Makers at Work.** Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Mcleod, G. (1984). The work of school board chief executive officers. **Canadian Journal of Education** 9/2 171-190.

McPherson, R., Crowson, R. & Pitner, N. (1986). **Managing Uncertainty: Administrative Theory and Practice in Education.** Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Mintzberg, H. & McHugh, A. Strategy formation in an ad-hocracy. **Administrative Science Quarterly** 30/2 160-197.

Schon, D. (1983). **The Reflective Practitioner.** New York: Basic.

Schutz, A. (1970). **Reflections on the Problem of Relevance.** New Haven: Yale University Press.

Van Maanen, J. (1982). Fieldwork on the beat, in Van Maanen, J., Dabbs, J., & Faulkner, R., (Eds.), **Varieties of Qualitative Research.** Beverly Hills: Sage. 103-151.

Warriner, C. (1984). **Organizations and Their Environments: Essays in the Sociology of Organizations.** Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.